

disconnected from the antenna feed circuitry and the internal antenna is connected.

1       The internal antenna 20 functions as a primary antenna while the retractable antenna  
functions as a secondary antenna." The Examiner infers from this statement that the  
retractable antenna provides signal-strengthening support to the internal antenna by  
being electrically connected to the internal antenna. Moreover, the Examiner cites claim  
5       10 which states that an external, retractable antenna is movably mounted on the  
internal antenna and is movable between a retracted position and an extended position.  
The Examiner believes that this language further indicates that the external antenna is  
connected to the internal antenna.

10      Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Contrary to the Examiner's  
statements, the Examiner's inferences are unfounded. The specification specifically  
states that a switching mechanism switches the internal antenna out of circuit and  
switches the external antenna in circuit when the external antenna is in an extended  
15     position. The specification further teaches that when the external retractable antenna is  
retracted, it is disconnected from the antenna feed circuitry and the internal antenna is  
connected. It is inherently evident from the above language that the retractable antenna  
does not work as a signal booster as claimed by the Examiner. The Examiner's  
assumption would make the applicant's disclosed structure counterproductive, because,  
20     as stated above, applicant's teaches that turning one of the antennas on turns the other  
antenna off. The applicant's language cited by the Examiner merely means that the  
user will use the internal antenna first. If the signal then fades, the user can extend the  
whip antenna which will turn the internal antenna off and the external antenna on. The

1 user is switching antennas, not boosting the antenna. As to the Examiner's concerns  
with claim 10, applicant notes that the external antenna is mechanically connected to  
the internal antenna. It is not taught or otherwise suggested that the internal and  
external antenna are electrically connected. Accordingly, applicant believes that claims  
5 7-13 do not introduce new matter as claimed by the Examiner.

10 The Examiner rejected claims 5, 6, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
unpatentable over Matai. The Examiner contends that Matai teaches all the limitations  
of the claims except for the transceiver circuit. The Examiner argues that it would have  
been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to  
know that Matai's radio circuit would have performed the same tasks as a transceiver  
15 circuit, and that Matai's use of the phrase "radio circuit" is analogous with the applicant's  
phrase "transceiver circuit."

20 Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claims 5 and 10 are  
independent claims with claims 6 and 12 depending therefrom, respectively. There is  
no suggestion in Matai that the antenna device can be modified in the manner proposed  
by the Examiner. Furthermore, the Examiner's proposed modification of Matai would  
not meet the limitations of independent claims 5 and 10. Claims 5 and 10 specifically  
recite that an external, retractable antenna is movably mounted on the internal antenna.  
As further depicted in the drawings, the antennas are mechanically attached together.  
Furthermore, claims 5 and 10 describe that the antennas are independent from each  
other. Claims 5 and 10 state that the internal antenna is in circuit with the transceiver  
when the external antenna is in the retracted (out of circuit) position. The internal  
25

1 antenna is out of circuit with the transceiver when the external antenna is in the  
extended (in circuit) position. It is not taught, suggested or shown in any manner that  
the two antennas are electrically dependent.

5 Contrary to the present invention, Matai specifically shows that the internal and  
external antennas are attached to opposite sides or between a PCB. Therefore, as  
further depicted in the figures of Matai, the retractable antenna is not movably mounted  
on the internal antenna as specifically claimed in the present invention. Furthermore,  
Matai specifically teaches that the two antennas are electrically dependent upon each  
other. Matai teaches that the "metal fitting 123 is electrically connected with the metal  
10 fitting 124 through the external antenna element 212 . . . By virtue of this input, an input  
of the radio selection circuit 134 is connected to the feed section (a) of the internal  
antenna means 111 to 114, thus the internal antenna means 111 to 114 comes into  
use." Therefore, even if Matai was modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner,  
15 the Examiner's proposed combination would not meet the limitations of independent  
claims 5 and 10. Accordingly, claims 5 and 10 are patentably distinct from the  
Examiner's proposed modification of Matai.

20 Regarding claims 6 and 12 of the present invention, claims 6 and 12 recite that a  
switching mechanism selectively connects either the external antenna or the internal  
antenna to the transceiver circuit. Applicant believes that Matai does not teach or  
otherwise suggest the switching mechanism as taught in the present invention.  
Furthermore, claims 6 and 12 depend from claims 5 and 10, respectively, Claims 5 and  
25 10 are allowable as set forth above. Insofar as claims 6 and 12 depend from

1 independent claims 5 and 10, the same are thought to be allowable. Accordingly,  
claims 6 and 12 are believed to be patentably distinct from the Examiner's proposed  
modification of Matai.

5 The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 8, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as  
being unpatentable over Matai as applied to claims 5 and 10 above and further in view  
of Chang. The Examiner contends that Matai teaches all of the terms of the claims  
except for a remote RF port. The Examiner further contends that Chang teaches such a  
remote RF port. Therefore the Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one  
10 of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to add to Matai's disclosure  
Chang's RF port so that another antenna may be connected to Matai's radio device to  
increase its received signal strength or to possibly utilize the port as an output port for  
another device that may be connected to Matai's communications device.

15 Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention for the following  
reasons. First, there is no suggestion in either of the references that they may be  
combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Second, the Examiner's proposed  
combination would not meet the limitations of the claims. Claims 3, 4, 8, 11 and 14  
specifically recite that an internal antenna is mechanically connected to a remote RF  
port. Contrary to the Examiner's argument, Chang does not teach in any manner that  
20 an internal antenna is mechanically connected to a remote RF port. Chang teaches that  
an electrical connector is connected to a PCB. Third, the Examiner's argument  
depends from the Examiner's above 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) argument. Claims 3, 4, 8, 11  
and 14 ultimately depend from independent claims 5 and 10, respectively. Independent

claims 5 and 10 are allowable for the reasons set forth above. Insofar as claims 3, 4, 8, 11 and 14 ultimately depend from claims 5 and 10, the same are thought to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 8, 11 and 14 are patentably distinct from the Examiner's proposed combination of Matai and Chang.

In light of the above remarks, applicant asserts that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 3-14.

No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, please consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 502093.

Respectfully submitted,



DENNIS L. THOMTE  
Registration No. 22,497  
THOMTE, MAZOUR & NIEBERGALL  
Attorneys of Record

Suite 1111, 2120 South 72nd Street  
Omaha, NE 68124  
(402) 392-2280

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the original of this AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL REJECTION for JONATHAN L. SULLIVAN, Serial No. 09/477,954, was mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, to Box AF, Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 13th day of June, 2002.



---

DENNIS L. THOMTE